4. Maquet E-5 (1950-1951) 1954 FO42 Rundi FO42

mugabo (a rich man) and a *mukungu*—a very rich man possessing a few cows, many fields, goats, and bee-hives. He enjoys the recognition of his fidelity to his master and his qualities as a labourer.

The Batwa never had the stability of peasants. They were hunters, potters, dancers, buffoons, and were regarded by their neighbours as being on the margin of society. They did not possess anything that others could envy. Consequently security from exactions was not such an important value for them. As people who lived a hazardous and unsettled existence, they greatly appreciated momentary and immediate satisfactions, and among these, food, especially during periods of scarcity, was the object of their activity. Their principal means of securing food varied according to their particular occupations. Hunters depended on their ability and their courage, of which they were very proud. Dancers, musicians, and buffoons relied on their talents and on the favour of their masters, their loyalty to whom was widely recognized. Indeed it is said that one could rely upon a Mutwa much more than on anybody else.

The social and economic situation of the Batwa explains and to some extent determines the value they attach to gratifying the basic need for food. Ability in their specialized occupations and a blind faithfulness to their masters were the best means to achieve that satisfaction, but skills and loyalty were also valued for themselves.

Rules of Human Action

These values, ultimate and intermediate, were eagerly sought by Banyarwanda but, as in any society, some means for realizing them were prohibited under certain circumstances. Stealing is rarely, if ever, culturally accepted as an ordinary practice for getting rich. Socially defined values are to be reached by socially approved means. We do not suggest that, in a particular society, the rules of action appear as merely social imperatives, or that the only basis for these rules is social. We would point out that some rules of action, whatever their origin and their philosophical foundation, are part of the collective heritage in any society. In Ruanda, as elsewhere, there are such rules of action. Murdering somebody who is not an enemy of one's family is prohibited. Women are forbidden to commit adultery and, among Batutsi and Bahutu, unmarried girls may not have sexual intercourse. When an order is issued by somebody in authority it has to be obeyed.

Does submission to the rules appear only as the rational behaviour of one who wishes to avoid an external punishment or is it moral conduct? Does a prospective offender refrain from wrong-doing simply in order to avoid very probable and unpleasant consequences, or is it his conscience which tells him that he should not follow his desire?

Of course this is not an either-or problem, but the question of degree or relative stress is important. Even in cultures which lay most stress on the moral motivation to action, external social sanctions are useful deterrents from prohibited behaviour. In Ruanda these external sanctions exist. Those

4: Maquet E-5 (1950-1951) 1954 FO42 Rundi FO42

who steal cattle, or set fire to huts, or commit adultery are punished by the political or family authorities. Social sanctions are not only physically enforced penalties, such as corporal punishment and compensations, but also the unorganized reactions of the people who know the delinquent: kin, neighbours, clients, and lord. For the Batutsi, for whom reputation stands high in the scale of values, this is extremely important. According to our informants, the fear of being considered a man without loyalty or without dignity, the dread of being despised by one's family, prevent many breaches of rules. To use Kluckhohn's terminology, we may say that Ruanda's is a shame-culture. But it is also a guilt-culture. When a Munyarwanda has transgressed some rule so secretly that there is not the slightest chance of his being found out and incurring punishment and shame, he nevertheless feels guilty and knows, our informants told us, that his action is bad. When a child has disobeyed his father without the latter's knowledge, he thinks not only of the unpleasant consequences that the discovery of his misbehaviour might produce but also (and some informants say 'mainly') of the wickedness of the act itself. The Ruanda word for conscience, *kamera*, means something that is internally felt. It is situated in the heart.

That the Banyarwanda have a 'conscience' will not be rated as a great discovery by some. But since some recent studies, such as Kluckhohn's on the Navaho, have stressed the fact that, in some cultures, submission to rules seems to be realized almost entirely through a rational concern to avoid punishment or shame, it does not seem superfluous to consider how far observance of rules is, or is not, linked to ethical principles and feelings of guilt.

Let us now attempt to indicate more precisely how moral wrong is conceived in the Ruanda culture. As has been already mentioned, *Imana* is not the guardian of the moral order. Sometimes he seems to be regarded as its author in the sense that he might have decided that men should not steal; but it is clear that when a man steals another man's cows, *Imana* is not personally offended. Those who are offended are those who have been wronged by the action, or those who had issued an order which has been disobeyed. When *Imana* has not been directly injured (as by blasphemies), or when the injury done to another has not been specifically forbidden by him, he is not thought to be offended. The victim could, however, ask *Imana* to punish the wrongdoer and if he then became ill, it would be said that *Imana* had punished him.

The other agencies of the supernatural world have even slighter relations with ethical values. The *bazimu* are naturally malevolent and punish only those actions which they take to be directed against themselves. A way to honour the spirit of somebody who had been a thief during his life was to simulate a robbery. *Ryangombe* and his fellows were not models of morality during their earthly existence and they did not care about the ethics of their followers. Nor was there any punishment after death. For those who believe that there are two kinds of life after death—happy or unhappy—the

4: Maquet E-5 (1950-1951) 1954 FO42 Rundi FO42

a very considerable extent universality and absoluteness, qualifies some of its commands. The degree of absoluteness and universality of the Ruanda rules of conduct is much lower. We might say that most of its precepts are qualified in relation to persons and circumstances. To steal cattle was forbidden, but a Mututsi could take the cattle of a Muhutu who had no lord. For a Muhutu to rob a foreigner was not forbidden. A wife might not commit adultery, but she was allowed to have sexual relations with people when ordered by her husband to do so and, even without her husband's permission, a woman could have intercourse with her husband's brothers and parallel cousins. Killing a man was prohibited, but not if he was an enemy of Ruanda or of the family, and if the feud had not been barred by the king. Banyarwanda certainly had no idea of rules of behaviour applicable to all men in virtue of their common humanity. This is perfectly consistent with the Ruanda conception of mankind and the very significant inequalities which Banyarwanda observe between themselves and neighbouring peoples and, among themselves, between the different castes.

To conclude, the rules of human action which prohibit or enjoin the use of certain means in order to achieve the culturally recognized values of Ruanda are sanctioned, not only by organized and unorganized social reactions but also by individual conscience or guilt feelings. The foundation of this moral code is not religious or supernatural but traditional; its content is a multiplicity of rules synthesized under a few moral principles. Particular precepts do not have a universal application but are relative to persons and groups.

Human Relations

Two principles dominate the field of human relations in Ruanda: inequality of men and indefinite reciprocity.

For the Banyarwanda all men have indeed a common nature; they are ultimately the descendants of the same ancestor. But this notion does not seem to be very significant, for Banyarwanda are much more impressed by the differences displayed by the various castes. The characteristics of these castes are stereotyped and repeated in many folk-tales. Batutsi are intelligent (in the sense of astute in political intrigues), apt to command, refined, courageous, and cruel. Bahutu are hard-working, not very clever, extrovert, irascible, unmannerly, obedient, physically strong. Batwa are gluttonous, loyal to their Batutsi masters, lazy, courageous when hunting, lacking in restraint. These characteristics, with differences in stress and shading, are generally recognized by all Banyarwanda. As they reflect the Mututsi point of view, it appears that the superior caste has been able to make other people see themselves in important respects as Batutsi see them. Moreover, those qualities are considered to be innate, not acquired. A Mututsi is born clever and a Muhutu impulsive. Some tales, more widely known than those concerning the creation of man, relate how the first Batutsi came to Ruanda

4: Maquet E-5 (1950-1951) 1954 FO42 Rundi FO42

time of the vote, they had considered it improper and impolite not to agree with their superior.

On the other hand, no superior enjoys a purely arbitrary power. There are norms which are informally enforced by social pressure; and this is particularly important for people so concerned about their reputations. Since, moreover, there are several chiefs of equal rank belonging to different political structures, it is not difficult for the subject of one superior to secure support in opposing him from another. Finally, there is the possibility of appeal to a higher authority empowered to control subordinate chiefs. All this limits, in fact, the authority of chiefs, but nevertheless the authority of a superior cannot be questioned by his subjects. They may escape, intrigue, or look for another protector, but they cannot offer direct opposition. The Western conception of contract, derived from Roman law, with well-defined obligations on both parties who are equal before and during the contract, is accordingly not understood or acted upon even by Banyarwanda who have long been familiar with our culture.

Any superior is a protector, and his protection is of the same character as his authority: all-embracing and limited only by his own convenience. In any difficulty, the inferior may ask the help of his master, and, if help is refused, it will not be on the grounds that the superior is not concerned with that aspect of the life of the subordinate. On the other hand, the superior himself will be the only judge of the limits of his intervention, for the dependent has no right to require anything from his superior.

Everywhere men in authority enjoy advantages denied to those whom they command, but it is often felt that justification is needed for these privileges. In Ruanda such rationalizations do not seem to be required. It is taken for granted by everybody, the subjects included, that superiors as such should derive profits from their position. The very high standard of living of Europeans is accepted without any criticism by 'traditional' Banyarwanda not yet imbued with egalitarian principles.

The conception of authority as all-embracing, unlimited, protective, profitable, and of inferiority as dependent, devoid of rights, fundamentally weak, and generally exploited, is exactly suited to a structure of castes composed of human beings who are thought to be fundamentally different and unequal. On these inter-caste relations all hierarchical relations have been modelled. This means that the conceptions and attitudes which have just been sketched pervade most human relations in Ruanda. Indeed, very many human interactions involve persons who, in Ruanda, are placed on a hierarchical scale: man and woman, husband and wife, mother and child, father and son, old and young, craftsman and apprentice, &c., and when there is also a superiority-inferiority situation, even though confined to one aspect of the relation, the whole of that relation is impregnated with inequality.

Another basic principle governing the field of human relations in Ruanda is that of indefinite reciprocity. Whenever somebody receives a service,

609 If a Mututsi approaches a European, he covers his mouth and
201 nose with his hand. This gesture immediately sets the Batutsi
186 apart from their subjects; the Bahutu and the Batwa do not do this. It is difficult to explain the reason for this gesture. The chief motive is probably the fear of being poisoned. I repeatedly noticed that when I handled their pipes to examine the decorations, they did not go on smoking them. Another reason for this custom
[826] is vanity; the Batutsi seem to regard their protruding mouths as ugly. Thus, it was very difficult to photograph Musinga with his mouth uncovered. Another reason why they cover their mouths may be the odor of Europeans, which is unpleasant to them. Washed with soap and water, Europeans are said to smell like
[302] corpses to the Batutsi who are pomaded and perfumed with rancid butter.

609 During my stay in Nyanza and after the departure of our [127]
186 expedition, which reduced the number of Europeans to ten, Musinga grew quite weary of the strangers. This was brought out, among other things, by an amusing incident. He decided that the offensive European odor had even got into his house, so he had the box of toilet soap which had been presented to him thrown into the swamp. Previously he had kept it in his royal treasure chamber.

It is clear that Europeans, with their angular, nervous movements and their ungainly, short, broad frames, so much more similar in build to the despised Bahutu than to the aristocratic Batutsi, are objects of secret derision. For example, I overheard the remark that the Europeans wear shoes to cover up the hoofs which they have in common with their donkeys.

[626] A Munyaruanda [Ruanda] who associates with Europeans is given the name inyanga Ruanda, "apostate," "renegade." Literally the word means "Ruanda hater" and is derived from the word kuhanga, "to hate." The name is regarded as a very great insult.

[582] The Batutsi are very exclusive. In their scorn of others they go so far as to avoid taking women and children from the subjugated Bahutu and limit themselves to women of their own tribe who are very free and easily accessible for men of their race.

181 According to all the Europeans who had anything to do with
563 them, the Batutsi are cowardly. In contrast to them, the Bahutu, who form the bulk of the Ruanda conscriptees, are praised for their

438 often set out on journeys lasting several days to visit customers
484 and distant markets. They handle the trade between Mulera, Nduga, and Katana on Lake Edward, and their chief items of exchange are sheep and goats, iron, salt, and tobacco. The Bagoye handle trade between Bugoye and Bunyabungu and exchange large quantities of hoes for goats from Mulera.

123 The Bagoye are unprejudiced traders. For example, when they saw me collecting skulls there, they brought me some to buy. However, no one had the courage to touch a skull. They carried it either on a stick or wrapped in a banana leaf. It was a boy of eleven who first had the idea of demanding payment for skulls. Others followed, even adults, when they saw that the boy was well paid. In a short time they brought in over 200 skulls.

We must point out, however, that not everyone was enthusiastic about these transactions. After more careful investigation, it was discovered that all the skull collectors were people of the lower classes. They were bagaragu (1) of the others and orphans

1. Clients.

who had been taken into individual households as semi-slaves.
●[626] After a few days, however, skull collecting stopped altogether, since the boys of the mission refused to eat with anyone who had collected skulls. When this news spread, I could not get any more skulls, and the last collector was thrashed.

The people were very much interested in knowing how much was paid for skulls in Europe.

567 Even today it is said that human beings are exported from Ruanda, not as voluntary emigrants and transient workers, but as slaves. I could find out little about this obscure problem. Since wives [164] are bought, it is very difficult to draw the line between a purchased slave and a purchased wife. In Kissaka the story goes that the Bassuwi come in large numbers to buy women and that they stay in Lukira. They are also said to re-sell the women in Tabora.

Dr. Kandt (1) says that there is a regular slave trade in the

1. Kandt, R., Caput Nili (Berlin, 1904), p. 435.

7: Roscoe M-5 (1919-1920) 1924
FO42 Rundi FO42

Meat was always cut from the bones before being served, 252
and the bones were given to the servants or to peasants. Men 264
sometimes ate with their families, but almost always they ate
alone and in secret, and even the food that was left over from
their meal might not be seen, for should there chance to be [626]
bones amongst it, the man was laughed at and made fun of
by those who saw it. It was the duty of a man's wife to cut
up the meat and remove all bones. If a friend paid a visit he 574
might partake of a meal only if he was with his host from the
beginning of it; if he arrived during the meal he was not
permitted to approach. The rules of hospitality were very
strict, and even a poor person of the same clan would be [614]
invited to share a man's meal, while the richest member of
one of the despised clans would never be allowed to do so.
Among the better classes the cooks were men, but among [462]
poor people women cooked for their husbands.

There were no special rules about fire; but it was always 372
preferable to obtain it from some other fire, and only if this
was impossible would they use fire-sticks to kindle it.

The Cattle

The people were largely agricultural, but cows were looked 231
upon as their wealth and they kept large herds, some running 556
even into thousands; while a man who was considered only
moderately rich would have four or five hundred.

The people, because of their agricultural pursuits, had fixed 233
dwellings, but the herdsmen wandered about with the cows [361]
for pasture. The cattle were of mixed types, some short-
horned and some long-horned; they were divided into herds
of two to four hundred, each herd being under the care of a
head-man and twelve or more others. They roamed the pasture
lands two or three months at a time without returning home,
sleeping in grass huts hastily erected, while the cattle were left [343]
in the open without fences. The calves were kept in the huts and
their presence prevented the cows from straying, while a watch
was kept to protect them from wild animals. The men stayed
only a few days in each place. The wives of the herdsmen lived

9: Maquet E-5 (1949-1951) 1961 FO42 Rundi FO42

The conditions favouring contamination by different diseases and the very limited defences against them permit us to assume that illness and mortality through these diseases must have been very high and a constant threat to everybody.

These brief notes on health conditions in Ruanda would be incomplete without a mention of mental health. We are not attempting here an assessment of the neuroses and psychoses which can be found in Ruanda or to the number of people affected by them and who, in the Western world, would be considered in need of psychiatric treatment. There is not sufficient information on these matters at present. But we would like to consider very briefly conditions which are likely to result in psychological tensions.

We have already mentioned the circumstances which make life objectively hard (a barely sufficient diet, starvation periods, and diseases). In addition it was often dangerous. When informants were asked what sort of reputation they particularly wished to avoid, they did not usually answer by listing the opposites of those particular qualities which they would like to have attributed to them, but by pointing to some definite reputation in which danger might be inherent. Above all, a Tutsi feared to be regarded as an enemy of the king. It was no doubt partly because he felt a genuine respect for the king, but mainly because to be thought of as an enemy of the king was extremely dangerous. It could mean dispossession of everything, the severance of all social relations, exile, or even death. He also feared to be considered a traitor to his chief. This was a less dangerous reputation, although it entailed sanctions: if a client had been disloyal to his lord the latter might take back from him all the cattle he had previously given him and eventually all his cattle. The Hutu said that they feared an accusation of witchcraft, for such an accusation could certainly mean immediate death. There was little that could be done actively to avoid such a danger except to be a good neighbour, to be envied by nobody, to have no enemies, and especially to have a powerful protector. The Hutu were also afraid of acquiring any reputation which could result in their losing the protection of the lord to whom they owed allegiance and consequently leaving them exposed and defenceless against the arbitrary actions of the powerful.[21]

[21] Cf. Maquet, 1954a, or Maquet, 1958.

9:Maquet E-5 (1949-1951)1961 FO42 Rundi FO42

Twa, as people living an active and dangerous life, and regarded as almost sub-human, had little to fear except being deprived of food by their master's whim.

All these dangers were real enough and no behaviour could ensure complete immunity. But most people appear to have felt that with some skill and right conduct they were avoidable and consequently did not constitute oppressive threats. Frustrations entailed by starvation and Tutsi requirements were regarded in pre-European days as part of an immutable natural and social order. Ruanda men and women were not inclined to speculate on the impossible, and any order of things other than that they knew belonged definitely for them to the sphere of the impossible. We shall see later on that a deep belief in the fundamental inequality of men had pervaded the ethos of the whole society, and had helped a great deal in the acceptance of frustrating conditions. Consequently these have not led to the usual feeling of aggressiveness or resentment.

Let us now turn to the invisible world as the Ruanda conceived it.[22] Although it was dominated by Imana, a god essentially powerful and good, it was a disquietening world. Indeed the spirits of the dead (*bazimu*), whatever their temper when they were in this world, were thought of as bad. The direct ascendants of the father's and mother's lines were usually protective if their living descendants had observed the proper filial behaviour, if they had not neglected prohibitions and avoidances, and if they had not forgotten offerings. But all other *bazimu* belonging to the same patrilineage were always harmful. *Bazimu* of other lineages were less dangerous unless there were feuds between the particular kin groups concerned. Among the spirits of the dead, a small clique, called the *imandwa*, was particularly powerful and might be helpful to those who had been initiated into the sect of Ryangombe, their chief.[23] Apart from these exceptions, ghosts were essentially malevolent towards living people. At best they did not harm. Of the two categories of men who had special relations with the invisible world, diviners and sorcerers, the latter were definitely considered to be criminals who either used poison (or other deadly substances as for instance when they mixed in food a powder made from the lungs of a person who had died from tuberculosis), or magical

[22] Maquet, 1958, pp. 526-30; Pauwels, 1958.
[23] See photographs in Maquet, 1957.

10: Albert E-5 (1956-1957)1963
FO42 Rundi FO42

431 554 he will not give; and if he wishes, he will take back what he has already given in order to give it to someone he likes better. An inferior, whether it be the serf of a Tutsi or a wife in relation to her husband, can protest only in vain that he has worked hard, that he has always been docile and obedient, that he has always liked and respected his superior. There are no formal sanctions against a superior who accepts services and goods from his inferior and gives him nothing in return. However, there are more subtle 431 554 measures to be taken against him. An inferior, if he has any alternative open to him, will abandon an ungenerous superior. Sometimes a Tutsi deserts a prince who has not given him cows 626 or a subchiefdom, in order to enter service with one who is more [564] generous and powerful. A son may leave the property of his father if he is not satisfied with his heritage and will enter service with a [593] stranger who promises to give him lands and cows. A woman will return to her father's home if her husband mistreats her, and ask her father to find her a better husband. When those who are dissatisfied complain publicly about ungenerous superiors, they will have difficulty in replacing the inferiors who desert them. However, if one does not find another superior with whom to take refuge, it is necessary to stay with the bad one and to resign oneself to unhappiness, sometimes to hunger, sometimes to death. For, 554 physical violence is the privilege of the superior. It is up to him to 681 instruct and correct his inferiors by words and blows. Or, if he is in a bad humour, his inferiors are always around, and he can take [586] out his displeasure on them. Children expect to be beaten by their [566] parents, serfs and servants by their master and mistress, and a [593] woman, even an *imfura*, considers it quite normal for her husband to beat her, especially if she has been difficult or if he has had a good deal to drink. According to the ideal, a superior is always benevolent, generous, wise and just. Beating does not suggest a lack of affection. If the superior does not give presents to his inferior, then it is known that he does not like him.

431 554 928 In principle, *umutima*, sentiment (literally, "the heart"), is always combined with the material value of a gift. *Urukundo*, love or affection, rather than law or rights, explains the gifts of superiors and the services rendered by inferiors. It is possible that the Rundi insist so much upon the importance of sentiment and love because [162] they have so little of them. However this may be, there is no doubting their joy and sense of well-being when they receive even the smallest present. However, they mistrust *urukundo:* love can change to hate very quickly, they say. Inferiors are always afraid that the superior will stop liking them or will send them packing